

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

· APPLICATION	N NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,	32	12/13/2003	Thomas Haft	US20030356	1361
173	7590	12/05/2006	EXAMINER		
		ATENTS COMPA	HECKERT, JASON MARK		
	ENAISSAN SEPH, MI	CE DRIVE - SUIT 49085	E 102	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
22.0	~~~~, ···-	,		1746	
				DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/734,332	HAFT ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Jason Heckert	1746					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess				
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICITION OF THE MAILING DISTRICT IN THE MAILING DISTRICT DISTRIC	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed * VTHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·						
,	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims			•				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application	١.		•				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5))☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
•	Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E							
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		received in this National St	age				
	application from the International Burea		transiyad					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
		·						
Attachmer	• •							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date					
3) N Info	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application					

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 18-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the liquid-using washing accessory" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to continue examination, it will be assumed that the applicant is referring to a "bulk wash aid dispenser" of claim 17. Furthermore, there appears to be some redundancy in these claims as claim 25 repeats the "bulk wash aid dispenser" of claim 17. Please revise said claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, 16-19, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marcussen et al. Marcussen et al. disclose a dishwasher comprising a housing 11, a door 14, a spray arm 17, a liquid-using washing accessory comprising compartment 22 and nozzle 46 provided in the door, and a liquid delivery system 44 in

Art Unit: 1746

fluid connection with the wash chamber and the accessory. Said delivery system also sprays some fluid from nozzles 46 to dispenser 23. As seen in figure 2, the delivery system clearly has a first portion 39 in fluid connection with the wash chamber, a second portion 44 carried inside the door, and a third portion defining a bend fluidly connecting the first two portions. The three portions form one integral conduit.

Marcussen et al. discloses that the door is hingely attached to the body of the dishwasher (col. 3 line 30) and clearly shows that the door can open and close in figures 1 and 2. Therefore, the piping or hosing must be innately extendable in some manner to allow for this action to take place, for if it were rigid the door would not be able to extend as depicted. Furthermore, the third portion is disposed in the region of the door's hinge axis and couples the first section to the second section when the door is closed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcussen et al. in view of Guth. Marcussen et al. does not disclose the hose portions as being extendable, however for reasons stated above, the hose portions must be extendable in order for the apparatus to function as described. Furthermore, extendable hoses are

Art Unit: 1746

notoriously well known in the art. Guth uses a flexible hose 94 in a dishwasher to run wash fluid from the interior of the machine to a spray nozzle in the door 14 through the hinge axis of the door (see figure 1). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, to modify Marcussen et al. by using flexible hosing to facilitate the opening and closing of the dishwasher door.

- 7. Claims 7-8, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcussen et al. in view of Hechler, IV. Marcussen et al. does disclose the second hose portion being located in the door, but does not disclose discrete multiple passages in the conduit. Hechler discloses a dual hose for the delivery of two fluids with at least two discrete passages 30 and 32. Furthermore, duplication of parts was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, to modify the conduit of Marcussen et al. as taught by Hechler, and provide two discrete passages for the supply of multiple fluids.
- 8. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcussen et al. in view of Milocco. Marcussen et al, as stated previously, discloses a transition portion coupling the first and second hose portions together when the door is closed as well as a valve 28 disposed in the water inlet to control flow. He does not disclose a shut-off valve disposed in said transition portion. Rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious. *In re Japikse* 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, shut-off valves are notoriously well known in the art especially for use in water inlets. Milocco discloses valve 11 located near the hinge axis 4 of a dishwasher

Art Unit: 1746

door. This valve has control means (col. 3 line 13) for controlling flow to at least one bulk aid dispenser 7 via passage 10 located in the door. Milocco further discloses a coupling means 17 and 18 for the hose portion located in the door and the hose portion located in the cabinet to allow for opening and closing of the door. The coupling means can be of the kind including a flexible watertight seal (col 3. line 39). Said valve and coupling are able to shut off flow when the door is opened and provide a seal when the door is closed. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, to modify Marcussen et al and add a sealed valve with associated coupling as taught by Milocco in the transition portion to control water flow to the washing accessory.

9. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcussen et al. in view of Jacobs and further in view of Guth. Marcussen et al discloses a valve 28 in the liquid delivery system, but does not disclose a multiple outlet valve. Multiple outlet valves are notoriously well known in the art, and their use cannot be considered novel. Jacobs discloses a dishwasher with an actuated three-way valve 92 used in the liquid delivery system. This three-way valve is capable of delivering fluid to different areas of the apparatus. As stated above, Guth discloses a hose with multiple discrete passages. Jacobs' valve, as can any other three-way valve, can supply fluid from an external source to the wash chamber and a hose with multiple discrete passages. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, to modify Marcussen et al and include a multiple outlet valve, as disclosed by Jacobs, in order to deliver fluid to different areas of the apparatus using the double hose taught by Guth. Such areas include the wash chamber and the nozzles in the door of Marcussen et al.

Art Unit: 1746

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Heckert whose telephone number is (571) 272-2702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Friday, 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571)272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMH

MICHAEL BARR LINVISORY PATENT EXAMINER